

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03475 201844Z

64

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 USIA-15 TRSE-00 MBFR-03

SAJ-01 SS-15 NSC-10 IO-13 OIC-04 OMB-01 CU-04 EB-11

CIEP-02 COME-00 RSR-01 /141 W  
----- 012380

R 201755Z JUL 73

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 910

INFO SECDEF WASHDC

ALL NATO CAPITALS 3153

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 3475

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PFOR, NATO

SUBJ: CSCE: PREPARATIONS FOR SECOND STAGE

REF: A) STATE 141074; B) USNATO 3367

SUMMARY: AT JULY 19 SENIOR POLADS MEETING, ECONADS CHAIRMAN REPORTED ON JULY 12 DISCUSSION OF BASKET TWO ISSUES ALONG LINES USNATO 337 AND DANISH REP MADE BRIEF REPORT ON JULY 17-18 MEETING OF EC CSCE SUBCOMMITTEE (SEE USNATO 3469). THERE WAS TENTATIVE CONSENSUS, INCLUDING FRENCH, THAT ALLIES SHOULD NOT TABLE DRAFT FINAL DOCUMENTS AT OPENING OF SECOND STAGE. THERE WAS GENERAL AGREEMENT THAT ALLIES SHOULD RESIST ANY SOVIET EFFORT TO GIVE DECLARATION ON PRINCIPLES GOVERNING RELATIONS AMONG STATES PREDOMINANT POSITION AMONG CSCE AGREEMENTS. SPC WILL TURN TO DETAILED EXAMINATION OF PAPERS CIRCULATED BY MEMBERS OF EC-9, BEGINNING WITH THOSE ON BASKET III ISSUES, AT MEETINGS JULY 23, 24, AND 25, AT WHICH TIME WE WOULD WELCOME ANY COMMENTS DEPARTMENT MAY HAVE. END SUMMARY

1. TURNING TO QUESTIONS RAISED BY U.S. REP AT JULY 12 MEETING (REF B), COMMITTEE CONSIDERED TACTICAL APPROACH WHICH ALLIES SHOULD CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 03475 201844Z

ADOPT AT OPENING OF SECOND STAGE. TURKISH REP, WITH SUPPORT OF PORTUGUESE, ARGUED STRONGLY AGAINST TABLING DRAFT FINAL DOCUMENTS AT OPENING OF SECOND STAGE. TURKISH REP, WITH SUPPORT OF PORTUGUESE, ARGUED STRONGLY AGAINST TABLING DRAFT FINAL DOCUMENTS

AT OPENING OF SECOND STAGE AND SAID THAT ANKARA FAVORED USING "ISSUES PAPERS" TO EXPLAIN ALLIED POSITION IN GREATER DETAIL. THERE WERE NO OBJECTIONS TO THIS POSITION. FRENCH REP RECALLED THAT PARIS FAVORED DETAILED EXAMINATION OF ISSUES DURING SECOND STAGE AND DID NOT BELIEVE THAT ANY TIME LIMITS SHOULD BE IMPOSED ON THIS WORK. ACCORDINGLY, HE SAID PARIS GENERALLY AGREED THAT IT WOULD BE PREFERABLE TO HOLD OFF ON TABLING OF DRAFT FINAL DOCUMENTS, BUT HE ADDED THAT THIS POSSIBILITY SHOULD NOT BE EXCLUDED AT PRESENT. DECISION ON THIS POINT, HE SAID, SHOULD BE TAKEN LATER IN LIGHT OF DEVELOPING TACTICAL SITUATION. (COMMENT: AS REPORTED USNATO 3469, WE UNDERSTAND THAT THERE WAS SOME SYMPATHY AMONG OTHER MEMBERS OF EC-9 FOR FRENCH PROPOSAL TO TABLE DRAFT DECLARATION ON PRINCIPLES AT OPENING OF SECOND STAGE. WHILE FRENCH REP AT JULY 19 SPC DID NOT RULE OUT THIS POSSIBILITY, WE HAVE IMPRESSION THAT HE WAS MORE CAUTIOUS ON THIS POINT THAN ANDREANI HAD BEEN AT JULY 17-18 EC MEETING. WE WOULD CONCLUDE THAT FOR THE MOMENT THIS QUESTION IS STILL OPEN, AS FAR AS DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES IS CONCERNED, AND DECISION WHETHER TO TABLE DRAFT FINAL DOCUMENT AT OPENING OF SECOND STAGE WILL BE TAKEN SUBSEQUENTLY, AT LEAST IN PART ON BASIS OF PROGRESS ALLIES MAKE IN REACHING CONSENSUS ON DRAFT BETWEEN JULY 26 AND SEPTEMBER 18. WE DETECT NO RPT NO ENTHUSIASM AMONG MEMBERS OF NINE OR OTHER ALLIES FOR TABLING DRAFT FINAL DOCUMENTS ON AGENDA ITEMS OTHER THAN PRINCIPLES. END COMMENT).

2. ITALIAN REP RAISED QUESTION OF WHETHER ALLIES SHOULD TABLE "EXPLANATORY" PAPERS ON INDIVIDUAL PRINCIPLES, ADDING THAT ROME SAW IN THIS GRAVE DANGER OF DIVIDING PRINCIPLES INTO CATEGORIES. IN ITALIAN VIEW, THIS COULD ENDANGER ALLIES POSITION THAT LIST OF PRINCIPLES IN MANDATE MUST BE SEEN AS WHOLE AND EACH PRINCIPLE INTERPRETED ONLY IN RELATION TO OTHERS ON LIST. ITALIAN REP SAID THAT FOR THIS REASON, ITALIAN AUTHORITIES HAD RESERVATIONS ON TURKISH ACTION IN TABLING "EXPLANATORY" PAPER ON PRINCIPLE OF NON-INTERVENTION DURING FIRST STAGE.

3. TURKISH REP ALSO ARGUED AGAINST ALLIED ACCEPTANCE OF SOVIET EFFORT TO GIVE DECLARATION ON PRINCIPLES STATUS ABOVE ALL OTHER CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 03475 201844Z

AGREEMENTS REACHED BY CSCE, WHICH HE SAID WAS CLEARLY INTENDED BY INCLUSION OF POINTS ON ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL COOPERATION IN DRAFT DECLARATION TABLED BY SOVIETS AT HELSINKI. THERE WAS GENERAL AGREEMENT IN COMMITTEE THAT ALLIES SHOULD RESIST ANY SOVIET EFFORT ALONG THOSE LINES. FRG REP DISTRIBUTED PAPER CONTAINING BONN'S COMMENTS ON SOVIET DRAFT DECLARATION (SEE SEPTTEL), WHICH CONCLUDES THAT SOVIET DRAFT COMPLETELY UNACCEPTABLE FOR ALLIES. CANADIAN REP AGREED THAT SOVIET DRAFT WAS UNACCEPTABLE, BUT OBSERVED THAT LANGUAGE USED WOULD NOT BE TOO BAD WERE IT NOT FOR FACT THAT ALLIES KNOW HOW SOVIETS INTERPRET TERMINOLOGY.

4. U.S. REP REFERRED TO PROPOSAL TABLED BY CZECHS DURING FIRST STAGE ON CREATION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE (HELSINKI 1840) AND NOTED

THAT IT WAS LOGICAL TO ASSUME THIS WAS SOVIET PROPOSAL. HE POINTED OUT THAT CZECH PROPOSAL GAVE ADVISORY COMMITTEE VERY WIDE MANDATE WHICH WOULD COVER, INTER ALIA, POLITICAL AND MILITARY QUESTIONS. HE ASKED WHETHER OTHER ALLIES FOUND CZECH PROPOSAL UNACCEPTABLE AND WHETHER THEY AGREED THAT DISCUSSION OF CZECH PROPOSAL PLUS ANY OTHERS ON FOLLOW-UP SHOULD BEGIN ONLY AFTER RESULTS OF SECOND STAGE WERE FAIRLY CLEAR. UK REP CONFIRMED THAT THIS WAS STILL LONDON'S POSITION AND ADDED THAT LONDON BELIEVED CZECHS MAY BE THINKING IN TERMS OF USING COORDINATING COMMITTEE AS BASIS FOR POST-CSCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE. NORWEGIAN REP OBSERVED THAT DURING DISCUSSIONS WITH CZECHS PRIOR TO OPENING OF MPT, CZECHS HAD USED TERMS "ADVISORY COMMITTEE," "CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE" AND "COORDINATING COMMITTEE" MORE OR LESS INTER-CHANGEABLY. BELGIAN REP CONFIRMED THAT BRUSSELS CONTINUED SEE FOLLOW-UP AS LARGELY TACTICAL PROBLEM FOR ALLIES AND WOULD INSIST THAT ANY CONSIDERATION OF SUBJECT DURING SECOND STAGE COME AFTER RESULTS WERE FAIRLY CLEAR. (COMMENT: WE ANTICIPATE FURTHER DISCUSSION OF ALLIED TACTICAL APPROACH ON FOLLOW-UP QUESTION. END COMMENT).

5. TURKISH REP ASKED WHETHER OTHER ALLIES WOULD PROVIDE INFORMATION ON SIZE, LEVEL, AND NAME OF CHIEF OF DELEGATIONS THEY PLANNED SEND TO SECOND STAGE. HE ALSO ASKED WHETHER ALLIES PLANNED TREAT DELEGATIONS TO SECOND STAGE AS PART OF THEIR PERMANENT MISSIONS IN GENEVA. (COMMENT: PLEASE ADVISE. END COMMENT).

6. COMMITTEE AGREED HOLD MEETINGS JULY 23, 24, AND 25 TO DISCUSS  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 03475 201844Z

VARIOUS PAPERS TABLED BY MEMBERS OF EC-9, CANADA AND TURKEY, BEGINNING WITH PAPERS ON BASKET THREE ISSUES. WE WOULD WELCOME ANY COMMENTS DEPARTMENT MIGHT HAVE. COMMITTEE WILL TAKE UP PRINCIPLES JULY 26, AT WHICH TIME IT WOULD BE EXTREMELY USEFUL TO HAVE COMMENTS ON FRENCH DRAFT.  
RUMSFELD

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 02 APR 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 20 JUL 1973  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** boyleja  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1973NATO03475  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1973/newtext/t19730767/abqcebhc.tel  
**Line Count:** 149  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** A) STATE 141074; B) USNATO 3367  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** boyleja  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 14 AUG 2001  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <14-Aug-2001 by izenbei0>; APPROVED <20-Sep-2001 by boyleja>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** CSCE: PREPARATIONS FOR SECOND STAGE  
**TAGS:** PFOR, NATO  
**To:** STATE INFO SECDEF  
ALL NATO CAPITALS  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005